



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,542	09/15/2005	Peter Rostin	4414-38	1651
80167	7590	02/23/2011		
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP 90 Forest Avenue Locust Valley, NY 11560			EXAMINER	
			HO, VIRGINIA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2432	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/23/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/549,542

Examiner

VIRGINIA HO

Applicant(s)

ROSTIN ET AL.

Art Unit

2432

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 15 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 10 and 19-26.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-9, 11-18 and 27-40.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
 See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Gilberto Barron Jr./
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432

VIRGINIA HO/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2432

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Upon further reconsideration, the prior art rejection of claims 10, and 19-26 are withdrawn and the claims are objected to as allowable but dependent on a rejected parent claim.

Regarding Applicant's challenge of the Examiner's Official Notice, Applicant is directed to Elgamal et al. (US Patent 5,657,390) (previously presented in Applicant's IDS), as an example of a client and a server being implemented on two different processing devices (Abstract, client computer and server computer) and of one or more software programs when executed by a processing device to implement at least one of a client or a server (Abstract, client application program running in client computer and server application program running in a server computer).

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, Applicant asserts that "the Examiner combines Menezes' teachings on page 9 regarding key transport techniques in which a session key can be computed as a function of inputs from both parties (i.e., of rA and rB), but in which the session key is not independently generated by the two parties, with Menezes' disclosure on page 10 of a key derivation technique in which both parties compute the session key as a function of only rB."

However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, page 10 describes a session key W which can be a function of inputs from both parties, such that rA and rB serve as keying material (page 10, lines 15-21). In this manner, it is clear that the key derivation technique in which both parties compute a session key as a function of only rA (page 10, lines 31-36) is not relied upon. The reference to the definition of W as a session key is only to establish the definition of W as a session key.